

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed December 10, 2007 (Paper No. 20071129). Upon entry of this response, claims 1-20 are pending in the application. In this response, claims 15-20 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of all pending claims.

1. Rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-20 have been rejected under §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by *Wasilewski et al.* (U.S. 6,157,719) (hereinafter "*Wasilewski '719*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because *Wasilewski '719* is not prior art to the instant application. The claimed features which are alleged to be disclosed by *Wasilewski '719* at Col. 6, lines 24-55 are also disclosed at Col. 6, lines 24-55 in an ancestor application (Serial No. 09/126,783, hereinafter "*Ancestor '783*") which is in a line of continuations of the instant application. Ancestor '783 has the same filing date as *Wasilewski '719*: July 31, 1998.

Wasilewski '719 does claim priority (as a continuation-in-part) to two other applications, and also claims priority to two provisional applications. However, no attempt has been made in the Office Action to show that the features in claims 1-20 of the instant application are actually disclosed by any of these applications with a filing date earlier than July 31, 1998. Applicant notes that the disclosure of a provisional, or of a parent of a continuation-in-part, is sometimes deficient in disclosing features claimed in a subsequent utility. Therefore, Applicant submits that *Wasilewski '719* is not prior art to the instant application. Applicant respectfully requests that if *Wasilewski '719* is maintained as a reference in a rejection of the present claims, disclosure of the claimed features, if present, be shown in the priority documents of *Wasilewski '719* before July 31, 1998.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and presently pending claims 1-20 be allowed to issue. Any statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known since the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicant's response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicant's undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Karen G. Hazzah/

Karen G. Hazzah, Reg. No. 48,472

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER
& RISLEY, L.L.P.**

600 Galleria Parkway, NW
Suite 1500
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948
Tel: (770) 933-9500
Fax: (770) 951-0933